

SE97 Telephone Follow-up Overview

Fishery managers are required by law to report the economic consequences of their decisions regarding the allocations of limited fish resources between commercial and recreational fishing sectors. High quality economic data are needed to evaluate the economic claims of constituents and to resolve potential political conflicts between the commercial and recreational fishing constituents as they compete for the limited fish resources. However, fishery managers do not currently have access to much economic information about recreational fisheries. This study intends to help fill the data and research gaps in our knowledge of the economics of marine recreational fishing.

Our objectives, broadly characterized, are twofold. The first is to collect social and economic data on the people who participate in marine recreational fishing in the various regions of the continental United States. Second, these data will be used to estimate statistical models of the demand for marine recreational fishing for seven to nine regionally selected species that are highly sought by marine recreational anglers and are either currently managed by the Fishery Management Councils and/or the Interstate Marine Fisheries Commissions, or are expected to come under management in the near future. For example, the 1994 Supplemental Economic Survey conducted in the Northeast Region as an add-on to the Marine Recreational Fisheries Statistics Survey (MRFSS) asked about bluefish, striped bass, summer flounder, Atlantic cod, black sea bass, tautog, scup, and weakfish (scup was targeted in the North Atlantic and weakfish in the Middle Atlantic).

The species-specific demand models (travel cost models and random utility models) will be specified to begin to answer questions about the economic value of or costs of two common forms of regulations imposed on anglers: (1) participation and access and (2) changes in catch (e.g., creel limits, catch and release, minimum size). In keeping with the state of the art in recreational demand modeling, the demand models will be estimated as being contingent on the choice to go marine recreational fishing and the choice of target species. This study will not estimate economic impact statistics, including multiplier effects for regional income or employment. Although, some of the data we collect could be used by others for this purpose (particularly data on anglers' expenditures), credible regional economic impact analysis requires an entirely different survey methodology. The focus of this large scale data collection and research project will be on the economic valuation of marine recreational fishing and catches by anglers.

Telephone Follow-Up to Intercept Survey Instrument

The economics telephone follow-up is designed to elicit additional social and economic information from anglers who completed the add-on economics survey. The questionnaire targets two distinct groups of anglers: (1) anglers who target--not merely catch--the selected seven to nine species of interest, and (2) anglers who targeted other species but happened to catch any of the seven to nine designated species. The questionnaires solicit social and economic data, as well as information about recreational fishing avidity, attitudes, and experience. These data will be used to develop angler profiles and to estimate statistical models of the decision to target a selected species.

Therefore, validation interviews to be conducted with economic follow-up volunteers should be administered during the telephone follow-up contact such that the validation interview precedes the follow-up interview. Individuals at least 16 years of age are eligible to respond to the add-on telephone survey. We believe responses from individuals less than 16 years old will not be valid and reliable within the objectives of the study. In addition, because of the personalized nature of some of the questions, proxy respondent-based reporting will not be allowed. It is understood that proxy respondents generally range from 15 to 20 percent of the total sample of 2 month fishing households. Further sampling controls based on gender will not be needed.

General Procedures

The telephone follow-up is designed to collect data which is not trip-specific and does not require immediate questioning of the respondent for accurate recall; these data shall be coded to match the identification code (state, site, date, and ID_CODE) of the MRFSS intercepted trip. Contingent upon the

release of name and phone number, an attempt shall be made to telephone individuals who indicate they would be willing to participate in a follow-up telephone survey (including multiple members of households). Only the anglers who were intercepted in the MRFSS should be interviewed; proxy respondent-based reporting is not valid within the context of the follow-up questionnaire. If after reading the introductory paragraph to the follow-up, it becomes obvious that the respondent has been previously interviewed about another trip (in a different wave or even within the same wave), an abbreviated version of the questionnaire will be used. Appropriate coding must be incorporated to allow the linkage of the records of these multiple interviews. Different versions of the telephone follow-up will be used based on target behavior, sub-region, state and random selection of specific question parameters. Two versions of Questions 1-2 vary by whether intercept target activity exists or not. Questions 7-9 key upon the identification of target species if they match the focus list or, if no target preference is indicated, require the random insertion of a species for the focus list. The hypothetical bag limit questions, Q.11-15, have different versions varying by sub-region and the magnitude of the proposed change. The different versions and random species insertions shall be administered sequentially, based on a randomized starting point, across waves and states within a sub-region.

Questions 11, 12 and 14 are of a similar type and will be asked either in a rotating order or randomized order pattern per interview to determine whether the sequence of the questions influences the response. The rotating order would be Q. 11, 12 and 14 for the first interview, Q. 12, 14 and 11 for the second, Q. 14, 11, and 12 for the third, then repeat. Question 13 can be either always be asked after Q. 12 or placed before or at end of the 3-question sequence. The follow-up questions (11a, 12a, etc.) will continue to follow their lead question. The order of the questions must be recorded and an ordering variable included in the final data to indicate the order pattern applied.

A version variable must be included in the data to document which of the different versions of each question -where appropriate- is utilized. To minimize recall bias, anglers should be contacted within 3 weeks of the time when they were intercepted.

For Questions 7-9, a particular species will be inserted if it is identified in either Question 1 or 6 and matches a pre-determined list of high priority target species. If no match is identified by Questions 1 or 6, then a species from the target list will be randomly inserted. The target list will vary by sub-region.

Two versions of this survey, a short form and a long form, were administered. The short form was administered to The long form was administered to all

Interview Justification

Each Question in the telephone follow-up will be used for the same purposes as the Questions in the add-on intercept survey. However, this information will provide further insights into angler attitudes, experiences, and travel behavior necessary for state of the art demand modeling.

Data Sets

Data sets can be obtained by contacting the National Marine Fisheries Service, Science and Technology division.

Administrative Statistics

- 55% of all attempts to contact those agreeing to be contacted by phone resulted in completed interviews.
- 58% of the responded supplied telephone numbers were successfully contacted
- Only 5% of those contacted refused to participate in at least some fashion.

Table 13: Interviews by Telephone Validation Potential

| 1997 | Respondent has home phone | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------------------|---------|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| | Yes | | No | | Unknown | | Refused | |
| | Count | Percent | Count | Percent | Count | Percent | Count | Percent |
| South Atlantic | 35376 | 88.8 | 1766 | 4.4 | 80 | 0.2 | 2611 | 6.6 |
| Gulf Region | 22359 | 95.9 | 583 | 2.5 | 147 | 0.6 | 216 | 0.9 |
| South East | 57735 | 92.35 | 2349 | 3.45 | 227 | 0.4 | 2827 | 3.75 |

Table 14: Validation Interviewing Results

| 1997 | Total Number Dialed | Result of Contact | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------------------|----------------------|---------|-----------------------------|---------|---------|---------|------------|---------|--------------|---------|----------|---------|-------|---------|
| | | Spoke with Angler | | No contact after 5 tries | | Refusal | | Bad Number | | Wrong Number | | Language | | Other | |
| | | Count | Percent | Count | Percent | Count | Percent | Count | Percent | Count | Percent | Count | Percent | Count | Percent |
| South Atlantic | 7347 | 4066 | 55.3 | 1655 | 22.5 | 251 | 3.4 | 541 | 7.4 | 618 | 8.4 | 42 | 0.6 | 174 | 2.4 |
| Gulf Region | 1812 | 902 | 49.8 | 457 | 25.2 | 69 | 3.8 | 142 | 7.8 | 183 | 10.1 | 9 | 0.5 | 50 | 2.8 |
| South East | 9159 | 4968 | 52.55 | 2112 | 23.85 | 320 | 3.6 | 683 | 7.6 | 801 | 9.25 | 51 | 0.55 | 224 | 2.6 |